

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 13 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishida (U.S. Pat. No. 4,360,192). Claims 1-8 and 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oriola, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,011,121). Claim 1 has been amended to define an annular bearing disposed between the main housing and the piston rod. The first and second seals are located on opposite sides of the bearing and a lubrication channel extends from the fluid chamber around the bearing to one of the first and second seals.

Ishida does not disclose, teach or suggest an annular bearing and a lubrication channel that goes around the bearing to one of the two seals. Figure 2 in Ishida shows four points of housing 5 which could be defined as a bearing but it is not an annular bearing as now defined by amended Claim 1. Figure 3 illustrates what could be defined

as an annular bearing but there is no lubrication channel going around the bearing to seal 28.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-4, 9-12, 21, 23 and 24, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding Oriola, et al., it discloses a first seal 67 and a second 66 but there is no bearing disposed between them as is now defined in amended Claim 1. The bearing in Oriole is integral with rod guide 21 which is not located between the two seals in any of the embodiments.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-8 and 13-24, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 23, 2005

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg